

I oppose loosening the rules designed to promote and protect diversity of media ownership. These rules were adopted to ensure that the public would receive a diverse range of viewpoints from the media, and not simply the opinions of a handful of media conglomerates.

In the area around my home of Boston, many local newspapers are now owned by the Boston Herald, one of Boston's two main dailies. There is considerable concern that this may diminish the quality of the reporting, as the parent company may try to reduce costs by running the same articles in each paper or assigning reporters to cover multiple towns, eroding their ability to develop in-depth analysis. Ownership is a crucial element of this equation. If these different newspapers were owned separately, or if there were even multiple newspapers in each town, they would seem to be far more likely to have well-developed, deeply investigated news coverage.

Despite cable television and the internet, the media is still dominated by a limited range of views, perhaps more than before. The promotional and marketing power of large media outlets simply allows them to drown out the smaller outlets, many of which people don't know about and may have trouble finding even if they look. Were this not the case, then media outlets would not put the energy they do into marketing. It simply takes money to get one's name out, and those media outlets with the most money and publicity are able to dominate the discourse.

This is not a healthy trend, and relaxing ownership rules would make it far worse.